

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 2, and 23 have been amended to overcome the § 112 rejections at paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action, and to correct formalities. Claim 15 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 26 and 27 have been added. Claim Sheets Marked Up To Show Changes are attached, along with a Clean Set of Claims, including all pending claims, as amended.

REMARKS

Claims 1-24, 26-27 are pending in the application. A Terminal Disclaimer is included herewith to overcome the double patenting rejections at paragraphs 7-15 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections is requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

New claims 26 and 27 are similar to claims 1 and 15.

Turning to the § 103 rejections at paragraph 6 of the Office Action, none of the cited references teach introducing ozone into a workpiece-containing environment at a rate of at least 90 grams per hour, as recited in claims 1 and 2. Similarly, none of the cited references disclose a system for processing a workpiece including an ozone supply system having a capacity of at least 90 grams per hour, as recited in claim 15. Additionally, none of the cited references teach controlling the thickness of a heated boundary layer on the surface of a workpiece to allow diffusion of ozone through the liquid boundary layer.

A high capacity ozone generator is preferably used to provide a high concentration of ozone into the workpiece environment, which increases the quantity of ozone provided to the surface of the workpiece (application, pp. 5-6). A high capacity ozone generator is especially useful in connection